

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,258	05/11/2006	Wolf-Dieter Wichmann	5000.P0098US	6585
23474 FLYNN THIE	7590 04/15/200 L BOUTELL & TANIS	EXAM	EXAMINER	
2026 RAMBLING ROAD			MCGRAW, TREVOR EDWIN	
KALAMAZOO, MI 49008-1631			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3752	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/15/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) WICHMANN, WOLF-DIETER 10/579,258 Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit

		Trevor E. McGraw	3752			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ad	Idress		
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. A consistent with the available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 (SIX 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Joint of the region is specified above, the maximum statutory period we provided for region is specified above. The maximum statutory period we provided by the communication of the communication of the specified above. The maximum statutory period we provided by the cofficio later than three months after the mailing and patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(p).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	,		
Status						
2a)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>16 M</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under <i>E</i> .	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro		e merits is		
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	☐ Claim(s) 2-11 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ☐ Claim(s) 2-26 is/are objected to. ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filled onis/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the cath or de	epted or b) objected to by the l drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National	Stage		
Attachmer	nt(s)					

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/CS) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application Paper No(s)/Mail Date ___ 6) Other: __ PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06) Office Action Summary Part of Paper No./Mail Date 03302009 Application/Control Number: 10/579,258

Art Unit: 3752

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaplinsky (US 5,135,174) in view of Bahr (US 7,066,186).

In regard to Claims 7-11, Chaplinsky teaches a sprayer for spraying agricultural liquids (apparatus system shown in Figure 1) with a carrier liquid tank (1), a carrier liquid pump (5), several spraying nozzles (21, 22, 23) and associated nozzle holders (22", "23" and "24" are held in "P") for connecting the spraying nozzles to a carrier liquid line (9,13), at least one active ingredient tank (2,3,4) and several metering pumps (6,7,8) for

Application/Control Number: 10/579,258

Art Unit: 3752

delivering active ingredients connectable to the active ingredient tank (2,3,4) characterized in that with each nozzle (22,23,24) holder ("22", "23" and "24" are held in "P") is associated with at least one metering pump (6,7,8) which is in flow connection with the nozzle holder (22", "23" and "24" are held in "P").

Chaplinsky also teaches where a control unit (32,33,34) is provided to calculate the active ingredient quantity to be metered in control pulses, the metering pumps (5,6,7,8) have a clearly defined delivery for each working stroke and can be driven to corresponding control pulses. The control unit (32,33,34) also has a number of control pulses as a function of a predetermined set value for an active substance concentration and a carrier liquid quantity instantaneously delivered by the carrier liquid pump (see column 3, line 31 thru column 4, line 21) and the metering pumps 6,7,8) can be driven in hydraulic pulses (pulses of content from tanks "2", "3" and "4").

Chaplinsky further teaches where the nozzle holders and the metering pumps are connected in series to the active ingredient line and are arranges in several partial widths and the partial widths are associated with active ingredient supply line and the sprayer has a mixing chamber and at least one metering pump.

Chaplinsky substantially teaches the present invention with the exception of the active ingredient supply line being provided with a compressed air connection so that during return operation active ingredient can be forced back into the active ingredient tank.

However, Bahr teaches that it is known to have an active supply line being provided with a compressed air connection so that during a return operation, an active ingredient or substance (liquid paint in the case of Knight) can be forced back into the active ingredient tank with the aid of compressed air. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to provide the active ingredient line of the spraying system taught by Chaplinsky with the compressed air line (recirculation line) of Bahr in order to provide a manner in which fluid can be conserved and accurate spraying can occur.

The combination of Chaplinsky in view of Bahr would permit the compressed air connection to be provided downstream of the final metering pump in the active ingredient supply direction and the partial width of the active ingredient supply line with one compressed air connection (limitations of claims 8 and 9).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-6 are tentatively allowed over the prior art of record.

Response to Arguments

Rejection under 35 USC § 103

Applicant's arguments filed 03/16/2009 have been fully considered but are moot in view of a new grounds of rejection to Chaplinsky in view of Knight.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Gill (US 4.925.096).

Application/Control Number: 10/579,258

Art Unit: 3752

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trevor McGraw whose telephone number is (571) 272-7375. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (2nd & 4th Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Len Tran can be reached on (571) 272-1184. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/T. E. M./

Examiner, Art Unit 3752

/Dinh Q Nguyen/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3752